

II. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 15 and 17 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly containing non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shi et al. (US patent no 5,875,296), hereafter “Shi.” Claims 9-10, 14, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons stated below.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIM 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has asserted that claims 17 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 17 to include a computer readable medium. Applicants assert that this amendment complies with the Office’s interpretation of statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has asserted that claims 1-20 is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically,

the Office objects to the term “directly” in independent claims 1, 7 and 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the original specification teaches that the indicator is stored directly as a result from a request and not as a result of a login. See e.g., page 7, line 27 through page 8, line 21. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8, 11-13, 15-16, AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 11-13, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shi et al. (US patent no 5,875,296), hereafter Shi. Applicants respectfully submit that Shi does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 7 and 15, Applicants respectfully continue to submit the Shi fails to disclose responsive directly to a request from a client for a web page hosted by a web server, storing an indicator that said client has requested a web page hosted by said web server. The Office does not argue this limitation correctly, but rather includes the “directly” portion of the limitation in the subsequent limitation. The Office, cites a passage of Shi in support of its argument to the contrary. However, the indicator in Shi is stored only after a user has logged in to the network. Col. 8, line 32-46. FIG. 4. To this extent, the authentication method in Shi requires a user to log in using a user id and password before the user can get any data from the system. Col. 8, line 47-51. As such, Shi does not disclose a verification method in which no initial login occurs, i.e., one responsive directly to a request from a client for a web page. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 7 and 15, Applicants respectfully continue to submit the Shi also fails to disclose responsive to a

request from a client for an element of said web page that is stored in a separate file from the web page and displayed as an embedded element of said web page. To this extent, in contrast to Shi, the claimed invention deals specifically with elements of web pages that are stored separately from the base web page but that are displayed on the web page in conjunction with the web page. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No. 54,593

Date: December 28, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)